UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,498	10/19/2000	Dmitry Paperny	2509/250	6742

26646	7590	12/31/2003

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER
THAI, CUONG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No		Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/692,498		PAPERNY ET AL.
	Examiner		**Art Unit**
	CUONG T THAI		2173

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Sept./22/2003 Restriction/Election*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-74 and 77-92* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *75-76* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-51,56-61,70-74 and 77-92* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *52-55 and 62-69* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-74 and 77-92 are presented for examination. Claims 75-76 have been

withdrawn from consideration in response to restriction requirement (filed on Sept./22/2003).

Specification

Summary Objections

2.   The summary is objected to since there is no summary in the presented application.

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patent ability shall not be negative by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-15, 17-27, 29-33, 35-38, 40-45, 47-51,56-61, 70-72, and 74 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (USPN: 6,295,061)

hereinafter Park in view of Horvitz et al. (USPN: 6,023,275) hereinafter Horvitz and further in

view of Lui et al. (USPN: 6,340,977) hereinafter Lui.

As per claims 31 (method), 1 (method), 77-78 (system), 85 (method), 83 (readable

medium) and 84 (readable medium); Park discloses a method for overlaying an object in a

window of a software application as the technique of a Pop up window overlay on main part of the screen (see Fig. 3), comprising the steps of:

Receiving, by a plug in control, a request for the object, the request being initiated by a behavior of a user viewing the window is taught by Park as the technique of the pointing device activity by the user is analyzed in real time and displays intended information and/or images near the pointer in real time (see abstract) through technology such as "plug in" (see col. 5, line 61);

Park, however, does not disclose the limitations of creating, by the plug in control, an overlay plane including the object and overlaying the created overlay plane with the window by the plug in.

Horvitz discloses the limitation of creating, by the plug in control, a plane including the object as the technique of the control buttons 34 for controlling the positions of the display windows on the various planes of the display system (see col. 12, lines 11-13).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Horvitz's teaching of creating a plane in into that of Park's teaching of receiving the object by the plug in control invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing more information to an end user in term of depth perception.

Horvitz, however, does not disclose the limitation of creating overlay and overlaying the created overlay plane with the window by the plug in control.

Lui disclose the limitation of creating overlay and overlaying the created overlay plane with the window as the technique of creating overlay Adjuct Window 850 and overlaying the Adjunct window on the top of another window 810 of window screen (see Fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Lui teaching of overlay and overlaying the created overlay plane with the window Horvitz's teaching of creating a plane invention and further into that of into that of Park's plug in control and Horvitz combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by capable of providing a created overlay plane overlaying with the window. Thus, the system would provide more information to an end user.

As per claim 30, due to the similarity of this claim to partial of claim 30, except for wherein the overlay is performed outside of the normal software application processing is taught by Park as the form of Plug in (see col. 9, lines 46), this claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 32 (method) and 2 (method), the limitation of wherein the window is a markup language document is taught by Park as the technique of displaying information as directed by HTML page 20 on monitor 14 (see col. 7, lines 14-15). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 33 (method) and 3 (method), the limitation of wherein the markup language document is an HTML document is taught by Park as the technique of displaying information as directed by HTML page 20 on monitor 14 (see col. 7, lines 14-15). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 35 (method), 5 (method), and 87 (method); the limitation of wherein the software application is a Web browser is taught by Park as the technique of WEB browser 10 interprets the HTML page (see col. 7, line 11). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 36 (method), 6 (method), 79 (system), and 88 (method); the limitation of wherein the Web browser is at least one of Netscape Navigator, Netscape Communicator, and Microsoft Internet Explorer is taught by Park as the technique of browsers such as Microsoft Internet Explorer and Netscape Navigator (see col. 1, lines 49-50). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 37 (method), 7 (method) and 89 (method); the limitation of wherein the receiving request by a plug in control as a result of the user clicking on a hyperlink is taught by Park as the technique of user can clicking on hyperlink of Naver.com (see Fig. 14). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 38 (method), 8 (method), and 90 (method); the limitation of wherein the receiving request by the plug in control as a result of the user clicking on a banner is taught by Park as the technique of user can receiving request as a result of clicking on any of Banner 1- Banner 9 (see Fig. 1). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 40 (method) and 10 (method), the limitation of wherein the receiving

request by the plug in control as a result of the user initiate a click event is taught by Park as the

technique of user can receiving request as a result of clicking on any of Banner 1-Banner 9 (see

Fig. 1). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 41 (method) and 11 (method), Park-Horvitz disclose the invention

substantially as claimed above. Park-Horvitz, however, do not disclose the limitation of wherein

the receiving request by the plug in control as a result of the user initiate a roll over event.

Lui disclose the limitation of wherein the receiving request as a result of the user initiate

a roll over event as the technique of "drag and drop" (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include Lui teaching of the receiving request as a result of the user initiate

a roll over event into that of Park-Horvitz combined invention. By doing so, the system would be

enhanced by capable of providing an enhanced tool to an end user.

As per claims 42 (method) and 12 (method), Park-Horvitz disclose the invention

substantially as claimed above. Park-Horvitz, however, do not disclose the limitation of wherein

the receiving request by the plug in control as a result of the user initiate a timing event.

Lui disclose the limitation of wherein the receiving request as a result of the user initiate

a timing event as the technique of real time or just in time (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include Lui teaching of the receiving request as a result of the user initiate

a timing event into that of Park-Horvitz combined invention. By doing so, the system would be

enhanced by capable of providing an enhanced timing event to an end user.

As per claim 92, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 37 in term of hot spot

of hyperlink, this claim is therefore rejected for the same reason applied to claim 37.

As per claim 80, the limitation of wherein the browser plug in control is defined using the

Netscape Application Programming Interface (API) is taught by Park as the technique of

Application program Interface (API) (see col. 6, line 40). This claim is therefore rejected for the

reason as set forth above.

As per claim 81, the limitation of wherein the browser plug in control is at least one of

Netscape Navigator plug in and Netscape Communicator plug in is taught by Park as the

technique of Web browser are beginning to provide many flexible powerful function. These

functions emerged through technologies such as "plug in", "script language", "virtual machine"

(see col. 5, lines 59-62). This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 82, the limitation of wherein the browser plug in control is an ActiveX

control is taught by Park as the technique of plug in using ActiveX technology (see col. 9, lines

46-47). This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 43 (method) and 13 (method), the limitation of receiving request, by the plug in control as a result a new window to be display is taught by Park as the technique of user can click on any of Banner 1-Banner 9 to open a new window (see Fig. 1). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 44 (method) and 14 (method), the limitation of wherein the new window is a markup language document is taught by Park as the technique of displaying information as directed by HTML page 20 on monitor 14 (see col. 7, lines 14-15). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 45 (method) and 15 (method), the limitation of wherein the markup language document is an HTML document is taught by Park as the technique of displaying information as directed by HTML page 20 on monitor 14 (see col. 7, lines 14-15). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 47 (method) and 17 (method), the limitation of creating by a plug in control a layer including the object is taught by Park as the technique of where the window or layer closest to the user is the active window or layer (see col. 8, lines 57-58) by using Layer generating Unit for creating a layer (see Fig. 7) of a Plug in (see col. 9, line 46). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 48 (method) and 18 (method), Park discloses the limitation of create layer with the window by the plug in control as the technique of where the window or layer closest to the user is the active window or layer (see col. 8, lines 57-58) by using Layer generating Unit for creating a layer (see Fig. 7) of a Plug in (see col. 9, line 46). Park-Horvitz, however, do not disclose the limitation of overlaying the created layer with the window, wherein the created layer is overlaid the window.

Lui discloses the limitation of overlay as the technique of creating overlay Adjuct Window 850 and overlaying the Adjunct window on the top of another window 810 of window screen (see Fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Lui's overlay teaching into that of Park's the created layer with the window and further into that of Park-Horvitz combined invention. Thus, the created layer is overlaid the window.

As per claims 49 (method) and 19 (method), the limitation of wherein the layer is a DHTML is taught by Park as the technique of technology such as layer technology disclosed in this application is merely added to help the reader to understand DHTML (see col. 9, lines 41-43). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 50, due to the similarity of this claim to that of 48 in term of using plug in control for overlaying the creating layer with the window and for bypassing the software

application provided mechanism for the displayer of layers, this claim is therefore rejected for the same reasons applied to claim 48.

As per claim 51, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 49, this claim is therefore rejected for the same reason applied to claim 49.

As per claims 56 (method) and 20 (method), Park discloses a layer as the technique of where the window or layer closest to the user is the active window or layer (see col. 8, lines 57-58) by using Layer generating Unit for creating a layer (see Fig. 7) of a Plug in (see col. 9, line 46). Park, however, does not disclose the limitation of layer is hidden from the user and the layer includes a reference to the object.

Horvitz discloses a reference to the object as the technique of the invention provides a method of utilizing left, right, front, back, upper, and lower planes (see col. 3, lines 32-34).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Horvitz's teaching of a reference to the object into that of Park's layer. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing more information reference to the layer's object.

Horvitz, however, does not disclose the limitation of wherein the layer is hidden from the user.

Lui discloses the limitation of wherein the layer is hidden from the user as the technique of overlaying the Adjunct window on the top of another window 810 of window screen (see Fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include Lui's window 810 hidden behind the Adjunct window into that of

Horvitz's reference to the object and further into that of Park's layer. By doing so, the system

would be enhanced by capable of maximizing the screen estate with reference to the object to an

end user.

As per claims 57 (method) and 21 (method), Park discloses the limitation of displaying

the defined layer to the user as the technique of where the window or layer closest to the user is

the active window or layer (see col. 8, lines 57-58) by using Layer generating Unit for creating a

layer (see Fig. 7). Park, however, does not disclose the limitation of wherein the reference to the

object initiates the streaming of the object data to the layer.

Horvitz discloses the limitation of wherein the reference to the object initiates the

streaming of the object data as the technique of Perform appropriate Window Transformation

(see Fig. 16A).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include Horvitz's wherein the reference to the object initiates the

streaming of the object into that of Park's layer invention. By doing so, the system would be

enhanced by capable of transformation of the window streaming information reference to the

layer's object.

As per claims 58 (method) and 22 (method), the limitation of wherein the layer is a

DHTML layer is taught by Park as the technique of technology such as layer technology

disclosed in this application is merely added to help the reader to understand DHTML (see col. 9, lines 41-43). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 59 (method) and 23(method), Park discloses a layer as the technique of where the window or layer closest to the user is the active window or layer (see col. 8, lines 57-58) by using Layer generating Unit for creating a layer (see Fig. 7) of a Plug in (see col. 9, line 46). Park, however, does not disclose the limitation of layer is hidden from the user and the layer includes the object.

Horvitz disclose the object as the technique of transformation of window (see Fig. 16A).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Horvitz's teaching of the window transformation object into that of Park's layer invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing more information reference to the layer's object.

Horvitz, however, does not disclose the limitation of wherein the layer is hidden from the user.

Lui discloses the limitation of wherein the layer is hidden from the user as the technique of overlaying the Adjunct window on the top of another window 810 of window screen (see Fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Lui's window 810 hidden behind the Adjunct window into that of Horvitz's transformation of window object and further into that of Park's layer invention. By

doing so, the system would be enhanced by capable of maximizing the screen estate with the object to an end user.

As per claims 60 (method) and 24(method), the limitation of displaying the defined layer to the user is taught by Park as the technique of layer closest to the user is the active layer (see col. 8, lines 57-58) by using Layer generating Unit for creating a layer (see Fig. 7). These claims are therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claims 61 (method) and 25, the limitation of wherein the layer is a DHTML layer is taught by Park as the technique of technology such as layer technology disclosed in this application is merely added to help the reader to understand DHTML (see col. 9, lines 41-43). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 70, Park discloses by the plug in control as the technique of through technology such as "plug in" (see col. 5, line 61). Park, however, does not disclose an overlay image including the object.

Horvitz discloses image including the object as the technique of window image of dynamic cursor sizing (see Fig. 15).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Horvitz's window's object image into that of Park's plug in control invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing image processing through plug in layer technology.

Horvitz, however, does not disclose an overlay technology.

Lui discloses the limitation of overlay technology as the technique of overlaying the Adjunct window on the top of another window 810 of window screen (see Fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Lui's teaching overlay into that of Park's plug in control and further into that of Horvitz's teaching of object image invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by maximizing an overlay object image on screen estate.

As per claim 71, Horvitz discloses the limitation of created image with the window using software mechanism for display the content with the window as the technique of window image of dynamic cursor sizing (see Fig. 15).

Horvitz, however, does not disclose the limitation of overlaying technology.

Lui discloses the overlay technology as the technique of overlaying the Adjunct window on the top of another window 810 of window screen (see Fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Lui's teaching overlay into that of Horvitz's teaching of created image with the window using software mechanism for display the content with the window. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by maximizing an overlay object image on screen estate.

As per claim 72, Park discloses by the plug in control and bypassing the software application provided mechanism for the display of layers as the technique of through technology

such as "plug in" (see col. 5, line 61). Park, however, does not disclose an image with the window for the display of content with a window.

Horvitz discloses the limitation of an image with the window for the display of content with a window as the technique of window image of dynamic cursor sizing (see Fig. 15).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Horvitz's teaching of an image with the window for the display of content with a window into that of Park's teaching of plug in control invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing an image with the window for displaying the content on the window and bypassing the software application provided mechanism for the display of layers. Thus, the system would provide more on-hand tool to an end user.

Horvitz, however, does not disclose overlay technology.

Lui discloses the overlay technology as the technique of overlaying the Adjunct window on the top of another window 810 of window screen (see Fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Lui's teaching overlay into that of Horvitz's teaching of an image with the window for the display of content with a window and further into that of Park's plug in control invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by maximizing an overlay object image with content on window and bypassing the software application provided mechanism for the display of layers.

As per claims 26-27, due to the similarity of these claims to that of claim 72, these claims are therefore rejected for the same reason applied to claim 72.

As per claims 74 (method) and 29 (method), the limitation of using a transition effect to display the created overlay plane is at least one of a transparent transition, a rotation object transition, a zoom transition, a wipe transition, a page curl transition, and a ripple transition is taught by Park as the technique of the image to be displayed is limited to a region which has been defined by the layer property control unit 27 and such image can be transparent (see col. 8, lines 63-66). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

5.   Claims 4, 16, 34 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (USPN: 6,295,061) hereinafter Park in view of Horvitz et al. (USPN: 6,023,275) hereinafter Horvitz and Lui et al. (USPN: 6,340,977) hereinafter Lui and further in view of Helgeson et al. (USPN: 6,643,652) hereinafter Hegeson.

As per claims 34 (method) and 4 (method), Park-Horvitz-Lui disclose the invention substantially as claimed above. Park-Horvitz-Lui, however, do not the limitation of wherein the markup language document is an XML document.

Helgeson discloses the limitation of wherein the markup language document is an XML document as the technique of internal language into XML (see col. 11, lines 54-55).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Helgeson teaching of an XML document into that of Park-Horvitz-Lui combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by capable of providing more mark up language to system's end user.

As per claims 46 (method) and 16 (method), due to the similarity of each of these claims to that of claims 34 and 4, respectively, these claims are therefore rejected for the same reasons applied to claims 34 and 4.

6.   Claims 9, 39 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (USPN: 6,295,061) hereinafter Park in view of Horvitz et al. (USPN: 6,023,275) hereinafter Horvitz and Lui et al. (USPN: 6,340,977) hereinafter Lui and further in view of Katinsky et al. (USPN: 6,452,609) hereinafter Katinsky.

As per claims 39 (method) and 9 (method), and 91 (method); Park-Horvitz-Lui disclose the invention substantially as claimed above. Park-Horvitz-Lui, however, do not the limitation of receiving request by the plug in control as a result of the user clicking on a graphical icon.

Katinsky discloses the limitation of receiving request by the plug in control as a result of the user clicking on a graphical icon as the technique of a graphical can be drag from the media access area to the sequencer to add to the media object represented by the graphical icon to the play list (see col. 1, lines 62-64).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Katinsky teaching of receiving request as a result of the user clicking on a graphical icon into that of Park's plug in control invention and further into that of Park-Horvitz-Lui combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by capable of providing more graphical edit tool to an end user.

7.   Claims 28 and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (USPN: 6,295,061) hereinafter Park in view of Horvitz et al. (USPN: 6,023,275) hereinafter

Horvitz and Lui et al. (USPN: 6,340,977) hereinafter Lui and further in view of Leberl et al.

(USPN: 6,288,801) hereinafter Leberl.

As per claims 73 (method) and 28 (method), Park-Horvitz-Lui disclose the invention

substantially as claimed above. Park-Horvitz-Lui, however, do not disclose the limitation of

overlay plane utilizes semi-transparent.

Leberl discloses the limitation of utilizing semi-transparent as the technique of

transparent or semi-transparent (see col. 38, line 28).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include Leberl's teaching of semi-transparent into that of Park-Horvitz-

Lui combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing more

transition effect to user when the user intent to overlay plane.

Allowable Subject Matter

8.   Claims 52, 62, and 66 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations off the base

claim and any intervening claims. Claims 53-55 are dependent on objected claim 52. Claims 63-

65 are dependent in objected claim 62. Claims 67-69 are dependent on objected claim 66.

9.   The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Examiner has carefully considered each of three claims 52, 62, and 66. None of the cited

art including Park et al. (USPN: 6,295,061), Horvitz et al. (USPN: 6,023,275), Judson (USPN:

5,737,619), Rosen et al. (USPN: 5,995,102), Cho Ho et al. (WO 00/48069), Helgeson et al.

(USPN: 6,643,652), Lui et al. (USPN: 6,340,977), Chow et al. (USPN: 6,370,541), Katinsky et

al. (USPN: 6,452,609), nor Leberl et al. (USPN: 6,288,801) discloses nor suggest a method for

overlaying an object in a window of a software application for creating step includes <u>defining a</u>

<u>layer using the software application provided functionality</u>, <u>wherein the layer definition is</u>

<u>included in the definition of the window</u> and placing the created overlay plane in the defined

layer (see claim 52), **nor** suggest a method for overlaying an object in a window of a software

application for creating step includes <u>defining a layer using the software application provided</u>

<u>functionality, wherein the layer definition is included in the definition of the window, the layer is</u>

<u>hidden from the user and the layer includes a references to the object</u>, and placing the created

overlay plane in the defined layer (see claim 62), **nor** suggest a method for overlaying an object

in a window of a software application for creating step includes <u>defining a layer using the</u>

<u>software application provided functionality, wherein the layer definition is included in the</u>

<u>definition of the window, the layer is hidden from the user and the layer includes the object</u>, and

placing the created overlay plane in the defined layer (see claim 66).

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the

payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue

fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for

Allowance."

Conclusion

10.   The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered

pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c) to consider

these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach the

method and system for.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to CUONG T THAI whose telephone number is (703) 308-7234.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:00 pm.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John W. Cabeca, can be reached at (703) 308-3116. The fax numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

        (703) 746-7238 (After Final Communication)

        (703) 872-9306 (Official Communication)

        (703) 746-7240 (For status inquiries, Draft Communication)

        Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-8000.

        CUONG T THAI
        Examiner
        Art Unit 2173

        ***
        December 26, 2003

        BA HUYNH
        PRIMARY EXAMINER